

What is to be explained:

Oct 14, 99

¶ note: Wf military option, or depiction
of President....

(giving mil. officers responsibility
for vicarious commitment to an
impossible task)

["Problem": We can't Make It Quit (killing
our troops and "national"
with extremity the

and we can't "extreme the limits" because
we can't find the (soon enough or

not "Phase III" long enough — they
don't stay put — hold

territory, govern it continuously,
don't try to deny it to our
presence (exclude us) or
operations; when they raid, they
"creep up" and then "slip away"

[the VC should trap"]
Ab Boe

Col. Rogers

TE Lawrence

(Kilman)

7 Pillars

(Noble
Savage)

like a gas

(I read)

Indian fights

TEL

an individual, acting to
inspire (use) "nationalism"

(to experience other experiences: neo-colonial —

like EGL: American ideals, talents, values,
procedures — and influence

(vs. other Experiences: Frank, SO, C)

in Goodenow

US Fed. Ct. in Humboldt Md.

Tuesday Oct 26 & Wed Oct 27

from line (last station)

Continue shuttle bus to Court

9:30 Continue 3A

6 mos. ~~Magistrate~~ Day

What is to be explained:

Decision to prolong a stale-mated war
at ~~un~~-high levels of costs (1961-68)
or at ~~decreasing~~ decreasing but still-high
costs - while driving public as to policy (think, plan)
and prospects - rather than to seek or accept
an end; for of withdrawal, or negotiations toward
a mutually-acceptable compromise (that would
end hostilities: e.g. attacks on us and on collaborators
(perhaps on intervening both!))

Problem: 1) esp. farther - to prevent of "win" - too
dangerous, of provoking still longer (unnecessary)
war - without adding much to chance of win.

2) ~~Failure~~ - ending on terms acceptable to opponent -
will be seen as "defeat," failure, humiliation -
while (2) War (continuing)
(b) Victory.

He behind he could keep it under control — to a degree he did — till he died!

2BJ — Same!

Kidnapper he did — did not (till he left office) seem then he planned — like JFK
(and N.)

CBJ + N for VN!

(JFK? I don't think so!)

(N lost in '60 — in (small) part

for "losing Cuba." see debate!

(He wanted invasion before election! If it had...?!)

BUT — Prior for JFK + CBJ of avoiding military revolt / migration — leads to right —

was (a) statements of great stakes
strong conviction
readiness + preparations
to escalate

(b) drift upwards — beyond (at least for CBJ) what he hoped for, planned, expected

they not above what military had estimated, signalled, warned
(vs. Kadi
Schles,
(Halbroth?)
McFadden)

If CBJ had had 2d terms,

or even come back in 1968, what?

ESC! (It would have failed totally for NVN —

2) avert disorder

and leaning back

mil. "think" is equivocal —

can it really be this stupid?

weaver for China

reckless? careless?

withhold / hurdle?

(when it proposed to back letting (1945) approved?

or "Serbian / Rogers?"

(My typ: Civ was convinced (MCN, CBI, + well as well)
big boiling would fail — as well as sacrifice
conviction (the best looks for thinks)
and being in China

MCN: 2) If we win in $1\frac{1}{2}$ years (end '66 - mid-67)

"No lose"
win win

I'm a hero — CBI has averted failure

[or if: SVN is quit in 1967-68]
it was —

(b) If we lose gamble:

1) Hanoi won't talk, or concede

2) ' doesn't back off: reinforces, attacks

3) "NVA doesn't go to "Phase II"

fight gamble over

the MCN is needed to hold down (hoping,
dangerous, unqualified escalation, pressed
by mil, Right, public

lie to the, "our strategy
is working" — by '67
(opposite of his win) —
driving VCS to near-
resignation, "coup"



5 Jan 2000

of VCS deal this way:

was with Curre 1961, 1962

Karoo (CIA) 1961-62-

Chen (CIA)

VN CIA 1954

(Bridge of Hanoi)

CIA 1954

1955

1958

(CIA) 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964

VN

CIA 1964, 68

1964

Curre 1981? (Hog)

Murphy? El Sol? 9 sub?

Sub 7, No

5 June 2000

if VCS deal this way:

war with Cuba ^(CIA) 1961, 1962 SU 1962

Kass ^(CIA) 1961-62-

China ^(CIA) -

VN ^{CIA} 1954 (Ridgway opposed)

China 1954

1955

1958, 1

VN ^(CIA) 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964

China 1964, 68

1964

Cuba 1981? (Hay)

Meininger? El Sal? or not?

Cuba? No

(Hayang?)

Czech?

1

Madness (

May saw Madness

but remained obedient

& silent

and enforcers

liars

propagandists

to keep status
across
affection, trust
loyal

DOWD: FEAR
OF OSTRACISM

(Harris will do
anything to remain
part of a valued
group.)*

Obsessional leader (LBJ and N)

and a code of obedient bureaucrats

Took a large segment of the public who

and the military - who

5 May 00

likewise - just as another ^{inside} ally
(of Mumt) were concealed (and unknown
to outsiders) (& hid about this policy views)
(i.e. JFK in '61, '63!) (Kupf ¹⁹⁶⁵ = '68)

- Hanks - in particular, LBV and N -
successfully covered and hid about this view,
role, decisions, etc

misleading public, conducting a secret
War/Foreign Policy

(see WWI: Secret War Ans
& Danahy (LBV, N)

both in election

(prospects, accountability
LBV '64, LBV '68, N '68, (N '72)
72

and in-between!

- & Congress did not clarify this of
Hanks

for Media, of investigation, pursuit of
leaks (of defectors, WB's)

press encouragement of WB's ^{does}

ask Hanks: How could this be done?
When

5 May 00

VX & Russ

Note difficulty of identifying
Inside Allies (or saving the experience, or
arguments)

Kozewall VX: Ball, Hughy, Clifford, Senatos
Deaver... (Thomson, etc.
Nagas

Hilom WPB

JFK: us. (CB)

JTM (us. PP)

McN?!

Russ: Asa Carter (!)

Real Butler... pre-retirees (Rickson
Devils Advocates us. Princes of Darkness McN...
Perle; Miller, Slocombe; ^{Bill} military?
(Andy Marshall?) (ask Butler)

Shaw wf...

How change this?

How increase release of docs? WB!

6-12-00

Persons 68-69

(Cins (Big 4) don't look good (compare
"2d level")

but mil. don't look good: BAD

or, i want to
let Pres say
about this
issue

Either i want to told Pres (what to do)

or what to did not tell Pres

or West or MCN

(what West was doing would prob. fail,
+ was wrong)

Then focus was on NVN, not SVN;
either grand war
or ARVN

(which was the job,
after Dien:)

Why did Taylor fail to influence JCS, HJS, West, Pres, MCN?
^{Warden}

2. NVN didn't want negot - esp. "Geneva" -
in 1964-68, or...

If USG had stopped bombing...

Did DRV want the, really, to stop
bombing?! or was this an excuse

for no-Geneva?!

Would it have been better to have Taylor come
back as CJCS in May '68?!

What got into West?

5-15-01

101 SANE AIR FORCE

(not so much,
~~to~~ JCS - but if
go along with
Air Force)

Pres is keeping mouth
to - 1) avoid giving

USAF + ^{any} all it wants

but (2) covered how
much he is giving

USAF, + wif! (+JCS)

Meade Rep; VN!

Debate right
result is more
(for VCS, or USAF, or Right)
than he wants to
give
or less!

So Pres & VCS
agree on
No debate ;
a "map control,"
(He doesn't directly challenge
USAF/VCS: ^{PO} Map or VN...)

VCS doesn't get
all they want;

(^{ICBM} ~~Guero~~: continuing
- VCS)

(on what they need
& is essential: VN
for success).

But they do get
much too much!

Does avoidance of
debate really prevent
this, or remove it?

(the American public
& conservative public, & others)

Sunday, 12:30 AM 28 Nov 00

Why was ^{Dem!} Congress so ineffective against
a Republican President?

(Where was Russell? Get his?

McG

re HAK to McG?

Hatfield

Nelson

ask Gale

Hyp: He dealt thru, as well as
public, passed about his policy;

like Tom McG: seriously

What was obstacle to McG-H?

55-39 both times

Who?

(En Fulbright: Why?

(does)

How impaired was if of Cambodia?

Laos?

What did if know of
his "negotiations"?

being

1972

being...

Hanoi...

NOTE:

Nov 7, 00

Goldwater allured debate in 1964 to be
a false issue:

Win, with esc, with G ("not/extended")

no more than the USPF

who did he have?

applicant of SPK;

extended? of LBJ

vs. "States go, advising effort, support"

with no hint "this was false,
would fail

2) as en cine advising agreed,
(back?)

3) ^{without} did some esc " en cine agreed

4) with G esc, as VCS agreed

(whether to be behind
or not; USPF did)

G (+ VCS) collaborated with LBJ on being what
about other true facts (of perception, advice (1), objective valid)

see Robert
Mann